



# BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

1 S. Main St., 9th Floor  
Mount Clemens, Michigan 48043  
586-469-5125 FAX 586-469-5993  
macombcountymi.gov/boardofcommissioners

## PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2007

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes Dated 10-10-07 (previously distributed)
5. Public Participation
6. Receive and File Final Report and Presentation from C&S Engineers on Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study (mailed)  
(Note: Final Report will be placed in commissioners mailboxes)
7. Award HOME Funds to Solid Ground, Inc. and Authorize Board Chair to Execute a Contract Committing These Funds on Behalf of the Macomb HOME Consortium (mailed)
8. Authorize Board Chair to Execute HUD Release of Funds and Certification on Behalf of the Mount Clemens Housing Commission (mailed)
9. New Business
10. Public Participation
11. Adjournment

**MEMBERS:** Vosburg-Chair, Mijac-Vice Chair, Camphous-Peterson, DeSaele, Duzyj, DiMaria, Drolet, Brdak, Rengert, Brown, Haggerty, Roberts, Gielegghem and Crouchman (ex-officio)

### MACOMB COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Andrey Duzyj - District 1  
Marvin E. Sauger - District 2  
Phillip A. DiMaria - District 3  
Jon M. Switalski - District 4  
Susan L. Doherty - District 5

Joan Flynn - District 6  
Sue Rocca - District 7  
David Flynn - District 8  
Robert Mijac - District 9  
Philis DeSaele - District 10

Ed Szczepanski - District 11  
Peter J. Lund - District 12  
Don Brown - District 13  
Brian Brdak - District 14  
Keith Rengert - District 15

William A. Crouchman  
District 23  
Chairman

Dana Camphous-Peterson  
District 18  
Vice-Chair

Leonard Haggerty  
District 21  
Sergeant-At-Arms

Carey Torrice - District 16  
Ed Bruley - District 17  
Paul Gielegghem - District 19  
Kathy Tocco - District 20

Betty Slinde - District 22  
Sarah Roberts - District 24  
Kathy D. Vosburg - District 25  
Leon Drolet - District 26

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

AGENDA ITEM: \_\_\_\_\_

**MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN**

**RESOLUTION TO:** Receive and File the Report and Final Study regarding Romeo State Airport, from C&S Engineers

**INTRODUCED BY:** Kathy Vosburg, Chairperson, Planning and Economic Development Committee

**DESCRIPTION:**

NOTE: Final Report will be placed in all Commissioner's 9<sup>th</sup> Floor mail boxes

**COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE**

PED 11-6-07

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Item #6

PED 11-6-07

Distributed

**Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study  
Macomb County, Michigan**

**FINAL REPORT-2007**

Prepared for:

**Macomb County Board of Commissioners  
Macomb County, Michigan**



By:  
**C&S Engineers, Inc.**  
39555 Orchard Hill Place Suite 450  
Novi, Michigan 48375



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

The Macomb County Board of Commissioners were approached by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) - Airports Division with a proposal for the County to take over ownership, operations, and development responsibility of Romeo State Airport. MDOT indicated that they would prefer the airport be controlled and operated on a local level. MDOT has owned the airport since 1998. In order to become familiar with both the financial and regulatory requirements for the operation of a public use airport, Macomb County issued a Request for Proposals for a feasibility study. The purpose of the study is to gain an understanding of the obligations associated with operating a public airport and what future economic potential the airport may provide to offset operational and airport development costs.

C&S Engineers was retained by Macomb County to produce this feasibility study. This analysis is not meant to define the final course of action. The ultimate purpose of this study is to serve as one of the decision-making tools for Macomb County for accepting or rejecting the proposal from MDOT to take over ownership of Romeo State Airport. A portion of the study has been funded through a 50 percent matching grant from MDOT.

### THE STUDY PROCESS

This study encompasses data collection including conducting an inventory of the existing conditions at the airport. Among the information is historical financial data, previous and pending development projects, copies of any management contracts/agreements, and information on the airport's historical and forecasted aviation activity.

Next, all data and information collected are further analyzed to best determine future costs of operating, maintaining, and developing the airport. An analysis of three potential operational scenarios will give the County options to consider when analyzing the costs of operating an airport in different stages of development. These three (3) scenarios include two airport expansion scenarios and one plan that involves operating the airport as is (no-build). The result is a combined operational and financial analysis for each alternative.



## REVIEW OF EXISTING MDOT MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

In 2001, MDOT made the decision to have daily operations of the Airport contracted to a private management company. A request for proposals was issued and steps were taken to negotiate a contract between MDOT and Romeo State Airport Management, LLC (RSAM). On December 14, 2001, MDOT entered into a 25-year agreement with the Romeo State Airport Management LLC (see Figure 2-1). Full copy of contract is located in Chapter 2 and Appendix A.

## PREVIOUS AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

All airport projects are based upon an approved Airport Layout Plan and the 2000 Airport Master Plan. The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) is roadmap for the airport to follow for development that is approved by the FAA based on a 20-year planning cycle. Development and improvements scheduled at the airport are typically based on a five year plan development plan. The schedule of projects at the Airport is a policy decision between the airport owner (MDOT) and RSAM.

### AIRPORT PROJECTS FUNDED TO DATE 1999-2006

Project Description	Discretionary	Apportionment	Fed. Entitle.	State	Sponsor	Total
<b>1999</b>						
Master Plan	\$0	\$72,824	\$0	\$8,092	\$0	\$80,916
<b>2001</b>						
Environmental Assessment	\$0	\$0		\$46,695	\$0	\$46,695
Design for South T-hangar area and access road	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
<b>2002</b>						
18.41 Acres SW Con N 31 Mile	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,110	\$0	\$250,110
Const. SW T-Hangar area/access road	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$860,000	\$0	\$860,000
Design for Reconst. Rwy 18/36 & Parallel Twy	\$0	\$0	\$171,000	\$9,500	\$9,500	\$190,000
<b>2003</b>						
Reconstruct Rwy 18/36 - Part B	\$1,000,000	\$0		\$55,556	\$55,555	\$1,111,111
Utility Coord - SW hangar area	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000
Design of entrance road, drainage revisions and admin bldg concepts	\$0	\$40,725	\$0	\$2,262	\$2,263	\$45,250



## Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study

Reconstruct Rwy 18/36 and lighting	\$0	\$702,950	\$120,000	\$45,719	\$45,719	\$914,388
Prelim Eng (ph1) for 31 Mile Road Relocation	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$50,000
<b>2004</b>						
Partial parallel taxiway	\$0	\$0	\$438,300	\$24,350	\$24,350	\$487,000
Cathodic testing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$1,200
Hangar door headers and rehab taxistree	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,000	\$0	\$137,000
<b>2005</b>						
Design of terminal site prep and access drive	\$0	\$0	\$56,000	\$12,250	\$1,750	\$70,000
New T-hangars	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000
<b>2006</b>						
Entrance Road 32 Mile to 31 Mile	\$0	\$607,600	\$0	\$132,912	\$18,988	\$759,500
Purchase 62 Acres S. 31 Mile Road	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,469,099</b>	<b>\$785,300</b>	<b>\$3,703,146</b>	<b>\$960,625</b>	<b>Grand Total \$7,918,170</b>

Source: MDOT (2007)

In addition, RSAM funded the construction of two new hangars valued at approximately \$800,000. The hangars are located on the southwest corner of the property. Since taking over ownership, almost \$8 million has been invested in capital improvements at the Airport.

Source: MDOT (2007)

## CURRENT AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The development plans for the airport were prepared in three stages. Although they do not exhaust all the variations which may be applied, the alternatives form an appropriate base to produce a "preferred" plan of development for the Airport. In most cases, this preferred alternative will be a blend of projects taken from different alternatives, with the more favorable points of each selected for presentation on the Airport Layout Plan. Appendix B, Exhibit B-1, 5 Year Development Plan lists items that remain valid development goals for the airport, but the time schedule for these projects is obsolete.

### The Stage 1 (Figure 2-3a) includes the following projects:

- ➔ Reduce Runway 18-36 to 4,000 feet to meet FAA mandated runway safety requirements (*Completed*)



- ➔ Appropriate development areas for new hangar buildings; administration building; and a new access road (*Currently under development*)
- ➔ Acquire any necessary aviation easements

**The Stage 2 (Figure 2-3b) includes the following projects:**

- ➔ Closure of or relocation of 31 Mile Road
- ➔ Expansion of Runway 18/36 to 4,300 feet (300 feet south)
- ➔ Acquisition of 54 acres of land
- ➔ Acquisition of 37 acres of aviation easements
- ➔ Construction of a 3,500-foot crosswind runway on a 6-24 (northeast to southwest) alignment with a full parallel taxiway

**The Ultimate Development Stage (Figure 2-3c) consists of the following projects:**

- ➔ Extension of Runway 18/36 700 feet south for a total of 5,000 feet
- ➔ Extension of Crosswind Runway 6/24 500 feet southeast to 4,000 feet

## AIRPORT INVENTORY

Included in Chapter 2 is an inventory of the physical and operational aspects of the Airport. This chapter will provide a simple overview of the airport inventory including: airfield, terminal area, ground access, parking, navigational aids, airspace environment, pavement conditions, physical characteristics of buildings, and a review of any potential or known environmental issues. Further, this chapter provides an overview of basic airport operations and how the airport functions on a daily basis with the current airport management and operations structure.

This is a basic visual inventory of the Airport and does not include extensive engineering or structural analysis of the buildings or the airfield components (runways, lights, etc.). An overview of aviation activity at Romeo State Airport, both historical and forecasted, will be analyzed to show usage trends at the Airport. Site visits to inspect the facilities and the 2000 Airport Master Plan were utilized as a source.

## EXISTING AIRPORT BUDGET & FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Romeo State Airport Management, LLC (RSAM) is currently working under a 25 year agreement with MDOT to serve as the airport operator and sponsor. RSAM operates and supports the airport through revenues generated on the airport and state and federal grants for eligible development projects. Projects supported by grants require RSAM to provide the requisite matching share. Historical operating budgets were only made available from 2001 to 2005 by MDOT and RSAM. Historical budgets prior to MDOT taking over ownership of the Airport were unavailable. The



## Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study

available operating budgets for the airport for 2001-2005 are adequate enough to give the County some perspective on associated costs of operations and the revenues generated.

An overview of historical and current operating costs and revenues is provided in Chapter 4. The overview provides a perspective as to the financial liability associated with the operation of an airport. Operational costs at Romeo State Airport include:

- Salaries/Payroll expenses
- Pavement, Building, and Property Maintenance (cutting grass; plowing snow; etc)
- Utilities (gas, electric, water, sewerage)
- Service Contracts

Revenue to the operator of the airport is generated from:

- FBO/Flight School Leases
- Aircraft Hangar Leases
- Aircraft Tie Down/Overnight Storage Fees

## ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE AIRPORT

Evaluating the economic impact of an Airport on a community or the entire County is determined using various methods and standardized formulas in Chapter 4. Demonstrating the exact dollar value of the Airport as an asset to the County is difficult to measure. Non-monetary benefits of the airport such as emergency/public safety utilization are not quantifiable in terms of dollars.

### 2001-2006 ESTIMATED ECONOMIC IMPACT

Direct Impacts	
Salaries	\$ 659,200
Airport Revenue (Rent, Etc.)	\$ 1,121,579
Fuel Sales Total Gross Receipts (est.)	\$ 826,979
Operating Expenses	\$728,690
Capital Improvements (MDOT/FAA/Airport)	\$7,918,170
<b>Total Direct Impact:</b>	<b>\$11,254,618</b>
Indirect Impacts	
Itinerant Aircraft Arrivals 2001-2007	59,400
Average of 1.5 Persons per Arrival	89,100
30% of Itinerants Visit County/Stay Off Airport	26,730
\$60 Spent per Passenger	\$1,603,800
<b>Total Indirect Impacts:</b>	<b>\$1,603,800</b>
<b>Total Estimated Economic Impact 2001-2006</b>	<b>\$12,858,418</b>



## Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study

Source: C&S Engineers, Inc. (2007)

Since 2001, more than \$12 million in direct economic impact has been generated by the airport with \$8 million from direct investment by MDOT and RSAM in construction at the airport. The remaining was as a result of on airport salaries/employment and operating expenses spent by the airport. Indirectly, transient traffic into the airport along with on-airport salaries has generated about \$668,000 in indirect impacts.

## AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 5 outlines the potential costs associated with development alternatives for Romeo State Airport. The development alternatives provide an overview of the costs associated with each including capital improvement costs and potential impact on future airport operations and revenues. This chapter is authored under the scenario of Macomb County taking over full operational responsibility of the Airport.

Taking over operations at the Airport requires public sponsorship and ownership of the facility- resulting in the ability to receive grant dollars from the FAA. Should Macomb County decide to be the primary owner of the Airport, the County will assume the primary responsibility of the day to day operations of the airport; securing grants; and handling any costs associated with operating an airport.

### ESTIMATED TOTAL 20-YEAR OPERATING COSTS & ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Category	No Build	Alt. 2	Alt. 3
Estimated 20-year Income	\$13,374,638	\$18,840,620	\$21,778,251
Estimated 20-year Operating Costs	\$13,586,749	\$18,118,806	\$20,352,766
<i>Projected 20 Year Operating Net Income (Loss)</i>	<b>\$(212,111)</b>	<b>\$721,814</b>	<b>\$1,425,485</b>
<b>20-Year Economic Impacts &amp; Capital Improvements</b>			
Estimated 20-Year Airport Capital/Land Improvements	\$7,000,000	\$13,865,000	\$17,915,000
Potential 20-Year Economic Impacts	\$25,906,167	\$42,770,411	\$45,666,352

Source: C&S Engineers, Inc. (2007)



## AIRPORT MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Chapter 6 provides an overview of the types of airport operations and management options. An analysis of three common forms of airport management and operations

The types discussed include:

1. Wholly owned and operated County Operated Airport
2. Airport Authority (County or local)
3. Private/Contracted Airport Management/Sponsorship

### PROJECTED 1 YEAR COUNTY FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS

	#1- County Operated*	#2- Authority**	#3- Private
Rental Income/Misc	\$296,000	\$0*	-
<b>Total Operating Costs</b>	<b>\$250,250</b>	<b>\$62,562</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>
<i>Projected 20 Year Operating Net Income (Loss)</i>	<b>\$45,750</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

\*With contracted FBO Services

\*\* Assumes County will share 25 percent of the costs; net revenues go to Authority to offset Airport costs; member communities of the Authority would be liable for any losses incurred

## OVERALL IMPRESSIONS AND COMMENTS

MDOT's existing development plan is obtainable and worth continuing to follow in order for the Airport to grow and serve the area. To assist in the decision making process, an evaluation of the strengths, opportunities, and risks associated with the ownership and operation of the Airport were evaluated.



## Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study

### AIRPORT STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS

Airport Strengths	Airport Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community transportation link</li> <li>• Close proximity to highways/businesses</li> <li>• Enhances local economy</li> <li>• Access to vacant land for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential market for light jet traffic</li> <li>• Existing development plan feasible</li> <li>• Attracting new tenants with new hangars</li> <li>• Attract traffic from Oakland/Pontiac</li> <li>• Only public owned airport in the County</li> </ul>
Airport Weaknesses	Airport Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aging facilities (hangars, terminal building)</li> <li>• Maintenance costs</li> <li>• No crosswind runway</li> <li>• Short runway (4,000')</li> <li>• Lack of quality hangar space</li> <li>• Losing based aircraft tenants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rising aircraft fuel &amp; insurance prices</li> <li>• Security issues</li> <li>• Surrounding land development pressures</li> <li>• Increasing operational costs</li> <li>• Economic/budget priorities</li> <li>• Competing airports w/similar services</li> </ul>

### Option #1- Reject Offer from MDOT

Should the County decide not take over ownership of the airport, MDOT has stated they will continue to develop the airport following the current Master Plan.

#### Next Step

- ➔ If the County chooses not to have ownership of the Airport, the County should immediately advise MDOT and communicate the reasons for not accepting the offer.

#### Results

- ➔ Airport continues to develop/operate under current agreement between MDOT and RSAM.
- ➔ County and local municipalities will have some input regarding development programs at the airport through MDOT outreach and stakeholder meetings.
- ➔ RSAM remains liable for operational and capital improvements at the airport and receives revenues.

#### Impact on the County

- ➔ County will benefit from indirect economic impacts from operations and visitors to the airport.
- ➔ No financial liability.



## Romeo State Airport Feasibility Study

- Should airport not become profitable or viable, there is a risk the airport could close and the property remains under State ownership.
- Surrounding land use decisions will impact airport operations unless municipal ordinances and master plans are amended to accommodate airport development.

### Option #2 - Accept Offer from MDOT

If the County desires to take over ownership of the Airport, the following steps should be taken prior to making a full commitment or taking possession of the Airport.

#### NEXT STEPS

- Advise MDOT of the County's intent to take over ownership at the Airport.
- Form an Airport Advisory Board and determine the best management methodology for operation of the airport (Private Management; Authority; FBO).
- Further evaluation of the financial numbers provided by MDOT/RSAM should be done.
- If neither the County nor RSAM are willing to assume the contractual relationship that existed, then MDOT must resolve this issue.
- County should not accept a transfer of ownership until contract with RSAM is either transferred (should the County desire) or broken and all legal and financial issues settled between MDOT and RSAM.

#### Results

- Any legal implications of the above action or financial liabilities will be handled by MDOT (e.g., investment in facilities by RSAM).
- Revenues could decrease if RSAM retains rent from the hangars they have already invested in.
- County assumes all financial and operational responsibility and controls development.
- Additional planning, environmental and engineering studies would need to be conducted to determine risk and feasibility of future development (funded by FAA/MDOT or County).
- MDOT remains involved in the programming and funding of eligible airport projects.

#### Impact on the County



- ➔ County will benefit from all economic impacts from operations and visitors to the airport.
- ➔ County assumes all financial liability and may have to subsidize airport operational and capital improvements overruns.
- ➔ Surrounding land use decisions will be impacted by airport operations unless municipal ordinances and master plans are amended to accommodate airport development.
- ➔ Financial investment by the County will be based upon type of management selected (County/FBO; Airport Authority; or Private Management).

## RECOMMENDED ACTION ITEMS FOR ACCEPTANCE

The following is a summary of recommended action items **if the County accepts ownership of the airport:**

### RSAM/MDOT CONTRACT

- ➔ Determine if the County wants RSAM to remain as the private airport operator.
- ➔ Require MDOT to complete any negotiations with RSAM regarding the transfer or cancelling of the existing agreement.
- ➔ All negotiations or settlements between RSAM and MDOT and RSAM and its contractors must be complete and closed prior to the transfer of ownership.
- ➔ MDOT needs to determine if rental revenue can be collected by the County on the new southwest hangars should RSAM not remain as the airport operator.
- ➔ Validate the Airport's finances.
- ➔ A complete inventory of the equipment/fleet vehicles that are to be transferred should be provided.
- ➔ Confirm commitment of MDOT to fund future capital improvements.

### OPERATIONAL

- ➔ Determine airport operations/oversight methods (County, Authority, Private or Operator).
- ➔ Become familiar with the FAA and Michigan operational requirements for a public use airport (staff training or hiring).
- ➔ Understand preventative and routine maintenance requirements for the Airport.
- ➔ Retain the services of an airport planning and engineering firm.
- ➔ Determine if FBO services will be necessary (if not using private operator) or if County employees will operate the Airport.
- ➔ Develop a business plan for the Airport.



## AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

- ➔ Continue with existing MDOT development plan/schedule.
- ➔ New hangars and airport terminal building are necessary to attract new tenants.

###

# **RECYCLABLE PAPER**

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

AGENDA ITEM: \_\_\_\_\_

**MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN**

**RESOLUTION TO:** Award HOME funds in the amount of \$554,253 to Solid Ground, Inc. so that it may complete its conversion of the old Red Cross Office Building into Transitional Housing for homeless families, and authorize Board Chair Crouchman to execute a contract committing these funds on behalf of the Macomb HOME Consortium

**INTRODUCED BY:** Kathy Vosburg, Chair, PED Committee

**DESCRIPTION:**

See memorandum dated October 17, 2007.

**COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE**

PED 11-6-07

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



# PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1 S. Main St., 7th Floor  
Mount Clemens, Michigan 48043  
586-469-5285 Fax 586-469-6787  
www.macombcountymi.gov/planning

Stephen N. Cassin, AICP  
Executive Director

Donald Morandini  
Deputy Director

October 17, 2007

## MEMORANDUM

### PLANNING COMMISSION

Ann E. Klein  
Chairman

Dan G. Dirks  
Vice-Chairman

Bernard B. Calka  
Secretary

Louis J. Burdi  
Elmer J. Kuss  
Dominic LaRosa  
Deborah S. Obrecht  
Bill Peterson  
Betty M. Slinde

**TO:** Kathy Vosburg, Chair and Members  
Planning and Economic Development Committee

**FROM:** Stephen N. Cassin, AICP  
Executive Director

**RE:** HOME Funding  
Solid Ground, Inc.

**Amount of Funding Requested:** \$554,253 Federal HOME Funds distributed as follows: Macomb County (\$443,169 Program Income), Clinton Township (\$42,340), Roseville (\$26,392), and Sterling Heights (\$41,812). No local funds are required

**Project Summary:** Solid Ground Inc., a faith-based, non-sectarian, non-profit organization, is seeking funds to convert the old Red Cross building in Roseville to provide shelter and comprehensive supportive services for homeless individuals, and families for up to 24 months. This will be the only facility in the County to serve intact families. The project is 70% complete, but additional funding is necessary for the facility to open by June 2008. The project will have a 20-year life, based on Federal regulations.

The facility will have 14 units and 43 beds, with:

- two elderly/disabled units, and twelve family units.
- a laundry area, and a fully equipped commercial grade kitchen.
- an on-site child-care and program area, and secure outside play area.
- a library, computer lab, and educational center, plus TV and lounge area.
- an elevator, and security system w/internal/external monitoring capacity.
- comprehensive services to families and family members to help them achieve independence. Trained professionals will provide these services.

### **Recommendation Considerations:**

- The project will address a growing housing need in Macomb County.
- The project is ideally located, and has local community support.
- The project is 70% complete. HOME funds are necessary for completion.
- The project will generate sufficient Match to meet Federal requirements. The use of Program Income reduces the Match requirement by roughly 80 per cent.

### MACOMB COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Andrey Duzyj - District 1  
Marvin E. Sauger - District 2  
Phillip A. DiMaria - District 3  
Jon M. Switalski - District 4  
Susan L. Doherty - District 5

Joan Flynn - District 6  
Sue Rocca - District 7  
David Flynn - District 8  
Robert Mijac - District 9  
Philis DeSaele - District 10

Ed Szczepanski - District 11  
Peter J. Lund - District 12  
Don Brown - District 13  
Brian Brdak - District 14  
Keith Rengert - District 15

William A. Crouchman  
District 23  
Chairman

Carey Torrice - District 16  
Ed Bruley - District 17  
Paul Gielegghem - District 19  
Kathy Tocco - District 20

Dana Camphous-Peterson  
District 18  
Vice Chair

Leonard Haggerty  
District 21  
Sergeant-at-Arms

Betty Slinde - District 22  
Sarah Roberts - District 24  
Kathy D. Vosburg - District 25  
Leon Drolet - District 26

Kathy Vosburg, Chair and Members  
Planning and Economic Development Committee  
October 17, 2007  
Page Two

- The project will generate additional Match for 20 years; \$176,000 in the first year alone, thereby supporting other HOME projects.
- Due to continuing contributions of labor and materials, it is possible that the grant will not be entirely used. Excess funds will be used for other projects.
- The applicant has, but needs to strengthen, capacity to raise operational funding for long-term project viability. DPED is facilitating this effort.
- The project will establish the County's leadership in addressing homelessness, with increased visibility to the Federal and State governments, leading to potential increases in homeless assistance in the future.

**Recommendation: Approval**, with Grant conditions as follows:

- The recipient will refine its Development Strategy to the satisfaction of the County.
- The project must be used as Transitional Housing and have affordable rents, as defined by HUD, for 20 years. A lien, decreasing in value by 5% per year, will be placed on the property to ensure compliance.
- The recipient must adhere to Federal, State and local law, and HOME Program requirements, including those governing activities by faith-based recipients.

# **RECYCLABLE PAPER**

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ FULL BOARD MEETING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

AGENDA ITEM: \_\_\_\_\_

**MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN**

**RESOLUTION TO:** Authorize Board Chair Crouchman to execute, on behalf of the Mount Clemens Housing Commission, HUD 7015.15, request for release of funds and certification

**INTRODUCED BY:** Kathy Vosburg, Chair, PED Committee

**DESCRIPTION:**

See memorandum dated October 25, 2007

**COMMITTEE/MEETING DATE**

PED 11-6-07

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



# PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1 S. Main St., 7th Floor  
Mount Clemens, Michigan 48043  
586-469-5285 Fax 586-469-6787  
[www.macombcountymi.gov/planning](http://www.macombcountymi.gov/planning)

Stephen N. Cassin, AICP  
Executive Director

Donald Morandini  
Deputy Director

October 25, 2007

## MEMORANDUM

### PLANNING COMMISSION

Ann E. Klein  
Chairman

Dan G. Dirks  
Vice-Chairman

Bernard B. Calka  
Secretary

Louis J. Burdi  
Elmer J. Kuss  
Dominic LaRosa  
Deborah S. Obrecht  
Bill Peterson  
Betty M. Slinde

**TO:** Kathy Vosburg, Chair and Members  
Planning and Economic Development Committee

**FROM:** Stephen N. Cassin, AICP *sm*  
Executive Director

**RE:** HUD Release of Funds

### INTRODUCTION

Attached for your review and consideration is HUD 7015.15, Request for Release of Funds and Certification.

### BACKGROUND

The City of Mt. Clemens Housing Commission (MCHC) has received, from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Grant to modernize and operate Public Housing in the City of Mt. Clemens. This grant is very much like the County's Community Development Block Grant, but is solely administered by the MCHC. Before initiating activity on this grant the MCHC must satisfy the Federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires an assessment of impact on the human environment.

The Federal regulations implementing NEPA require that a Responsible Entity certify, to HUD, that the environmental processes have been followed. The Responsible Entity assumes jurisdiction of the Federal courts if an action is brought to enforce those responsibilities. HUD does not recognize the MCHC as a Responsible Entity, and it requested that the County serve on its behalf.

An environmental assessment and Notice of Finding of No Significant Effect has been prepared and has been posted in three locations in the County, in conformance with Federal requirements. The Notice will expire on November 8, 2007. The County, through the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners, may execute the Request for Release of Funds and Certification, on November 10, 2007.

### REQUESTED ACTION

The Board is asked to authorize the Board Chair to execute the Request for Release of Funds and Certification, on November 10, 2007.

## MACOMB COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Andrey Duzyj - District 1  
Marvin E. Sauger - District 2  
Phillip A. DiMaria - District 3  
Jon M. Switalski - District 4  
Susan L. Doherty - District 5  
Joan Flynn - District 6  
Sue Rocca - District 7  
David Flynn - District 8  
Robert Mijac - District 9  
Philis DeSaele - District 10

Ed Szczepanski - District 11  
Peter J. Lund - District 12  
Don Brown - District 13  
Brian Brdak - District 14  
Keith Rengert - District 15

William A. Crouchman  
District 23  
Chairman

Dana Camphous-Peterson  
District 18  
Vice Chair

Leonard Haggerty  
District 21  
Sergeant-at-Arms

Carey Torrice - District 16  
Ed Bruley - District 17  
Paul Gielegghem - District 19  
Kathy Tocco - District 20

Betty Slinde - District 22  
Sarah Roberts - District 24  
Kathy D. Vosburg - District 25  
Leon Drolet - District 26